H

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/767,857	01/24/2001	Keiji Hashimoto	1538.1008/JDH	3366

			EXAMINER
21171	7590	08/13/2004	RAMPURIA, SATISH

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2124	

DATE MAILED: 08/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/767,857	HASHIMOTO ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Satish S. Rampuria	2124

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>03</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 May 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-7 and 10-21* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-7 and 10-21* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *14 May 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

PTOL-326 (Rev. 1-04)   Office Action Summary   Part of Paper No./Mail Date 08062004

Response to Amendment

1. This office action is in response to the amendment filed on 05/14/2004.

2. Claims 2 and 8-9 have been cancelled by applicant.

3. Claims 1, 3-7, and 10-21 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101 Utility

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The claim is non-statutory because it recites components of automatic program generating, representing functional descriptive material without a computer readable medium or computer implemented, program per se are not tangibly embodied. Claim 7 thus amounts to only abstract idea and is nonstatutory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Chigira above in view of Stack, US Patent No. 6,257,774.

As per claim 1, Chigira discloses:

- *An automatic program generation apparatus for automatically generating a*

  program (col. 1, lines 46-48 "provided an automatic program generation

  apparatus in a computer program development support system")

- *that will perform a predetermined processing, comprising* (col. 1, lines 49-50

  "input information relating to manner of use of data");

- *a plurality of data structure resolution units* (col.2, lines 42-43 "a plurality of

  program part prototypes as a program part prototype library")

- *that respectively include a model program* (col. 1, lines 52-53 "a processing unit

  for generating program parts from the program part prototypes")

- *for a corresponding data structure* (col. 1, lines 54-56 "the input information is

  analyzed, one of the program part prototypes stored in the memory unit is selected

  in accordance with the analysis")

- *wherein said model program includes resolution logic for performing a setting*

  peculiar to said predetermined processing (col. 2, lines 45-48 "the input

  information is analyzed, one of the program part prototypes stored in the memory

  unit is selected in accordance with the analysis (setting peculiar), and the selected

  program is modified in accordance with the analysis to generate a program"). It is

  interpreted that input information is a setting indicating which processor to select

  according to information.

- *and a resolution unit for generating a program* (col. 1, lines 52-53 "a processing

  unit for generating program parts from the program part prototypes") *for*

  performing said predetermined processing (col. 1, lines "63-64 "program is

  generated based on the selected (predetermined) program part prototype") *by*

  acquiring resolution information relating to (col. 2, lines 39-40 "information

  relating to the manner of use of the data") said setting peculiar to said

  predetermined processing for the resolution logic (col. 2, lines 45-48 "the input

  information is analyzed, one of the program part prototypes stored in the memory

  unit is selected in accordance with the analysis (setting peculiar), and the selected

  program is modified in accordance with the analysis to generate a program")

  included in said model program in said data structure resolution unit

  corresponding to a selected data structure (col. 2, lines 51-56 "The program part

  to be generated is designated by the processing unit 22 which receives the data to

  be processed by the program and the information relating to the manner of use of

  the data from the input/output unit 21 through a general purpose text editor and

  analyzes it");

- *wherein said resolution unit comprises an analyser that analyzes said resolution*

  logic included in said model program in said data structure resolution unit

  corresponding to the selected data structure (col. 2, lines 44-48 "a processing

  unit for generating a program part by analyzing the input information to the

  input/output unit 21, selecting one of the program part prototypes from the

  memory unit 23 in accordance with the analysis and modifying the selected

  program part prototype").

Chigira does not explicitly prompts a user to input said resolution information for said

resolution logic based on the analysis and synthesizing the model program and the

acquired resolution information for the resolution logic.'

However, Stack discloses in an analogous computer system prompts a user to

input said resolution information for said resolution logic based on the analysis (col. 5,

lines 24-28 "The process 70 begins with the election of a user choice 72 to define the file

structure 74, define a program structure 76, or create a field definition 78. With each of

these choices, the user is prompted, and provided with starting text as appropriate,

through a process that results in the production of definitions and text representing the

user's further inputs" see fig. 5 and related discussion) and synthesizing the model

program and the acquired resolution information for the resolution logic (col. 1, lines 54-

63 "program synthesizers based on libraries of pre-established program parts have been

proposed. A library based program synthesizer... program generator operates from

defined data to select a best match of a program part prototype from a part prototype

library. Each program part prototype stored by the library is predefined and statically

maintained as part of the library until selection during program generation").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of prompting the user to get

the input and synthesizing the program parts as taught by Stack into the method of

automatic program generation as taught by Chigira. The modification would be obvious

because of one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to have the user prompt for

the input to generate the program by selecting the suitable program components as

suggested by Stack (col. 3, lines 27-36).

As per claim 3, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Chigira discloses:

- *the data structure resolution unit corresponding to the selected data structure is*

  either a one or a various types of data structure (col. 4, lines 23-25 "Through the

  function, one program prototype can be flexibly applied to various data (structure)

  without addition or modification").

As per claim 4 the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Chigira discloses:

- *a first model program that prescribes a data structure comprising one or a*

  plurality of record types (col. 3, lines 31-32 "After the analysis, the processing

  unit 22 prepares the data attribute analysis table shown in FIG. 5")

- *and a link between record types if a plurality of record type exists*, and that

  includes resolution logic for performing a setting for said predetermined

  processing *as to said data structure* (col. 3, lines 33-35 "the processing unit 22

  selects one of the program part prototypes from the program part prototype library

  by referring to the analysis (predetermined settings) table");

- *and a second model program that includes resolution logic* for performing a

  setting for said predetermined processing as to an operation, *and that corresponds*

  to a basic operation executed for said data structure (col.3, lines 24-28 "The

  input information designates the data declaration statement to be processed by the

program, the manner of use of the data (class) and the key where the class

designates the retrieval table").

As per claim 5, Chigira discloses:

- *An automatic program generation program embodied on a medium for automatically generating a program* (col. 1, lines 46-48 "provided an automatic program generation apparatus in a computer program development support system") *that will perform a predetermined processing,* (col. 1, lines 49-50 "input information relating to manner of use of data") said automatic program generation program comprising:

- *acquiring resolution information relating to* (col. 2, lines 39-40 "information relating to the manner of use of the data") *said setting peculiar to said predetermined processing for the resolution logic* (col. 2, lines 45-48 "the input information is analyzed, one of the program part prototypes stored in the memory unit is selected in accordance with the analysis (setting peculiar), and the selected program is modified in accordance with the analysis to generate a program") *included in a model program in a data structure resolution unit corresponding to a selected data structure* (col. 2, lines 51-56 "The program part to be generated is designated by the processing unit 22 which receives the data to be processed by the program and the information relating to the manner of use of the data from the input/output unit 21 through a general purpose text editor and analyzes it") *wherein said data structure resolution unit* (col.2, lines 42-43 "a plurality of program part prototypes as a program part prototype library") *includes said*

model program (col. 1, lines 52-53 "a processing unit for generating program parts from the program part prototypes") *for a corresponding data structure* (col. 1, lines 54-56 "the input information is analyzed, one of the program part prototypes stored in the memory unit is selected in accordance with the analysis"), *and said model program includes resolution logic for performing a setting peculiar to said predetermined processing* (col. 2, lines 45-48 "the input information is analyzed, one of the program part prototypes stored in the memory unit is selected in accordance with the analysis (setting peculiar), and the selected program is modified in accordance with the analysis to generate a program"). It is interpreted that input information is a setting indicating which processor to select according to information.

- *generating a program* (col. 1, lines 52-53 "a processing unit for generating program parts from the program part prototypes") *for performing said predetermined processing* (col. 1, lines "63-64 "program is generated based on the selected (predetermined) program part prototype")

- *wherein said resolution unit comprises an analyser that analyzes said resolution logic included in said model program in said data structure resolution unit corresponding to the selected data structure* (col. 2, lines 44-48 "a processing unit for generating a program part by analyzing the input information to the input/output unit 21, selecting one of the program part prototypes from the memory unit 23 in accordance with the analysis and modifying the selected program part prototype").

Chigira does not explicitly prompts a user to input said resolution information for said resolution logic based on the analysis and synthesizing the model program and the acquired resolution information for the resolution logic.

However, Stack discloses in an analogous computer system prompts a user to input said resolution information for said resolution logic based on the analysis (col. 5, lines 24-28 "The process 70 begins with the election of a user choice 72 to define the file structure 74, define a program structure 76, or create a field definition 78. With each of these choices, the user is prompted, and provided with starting text as appropriate, through a process that results in the production of definitions and text representing the user's further inputs" see fig. 5 and related discussion) and synthesizing the model program and the acquired resolution information for the resolution logic (col. 1, lines 54-63 "program synthesizers based on libraries of pre-established program parts have been proposed. A library based program synthesizer... program generator operates from defined data to select a best match of a program part prototype from a part prototype library. Each program part prototype stored by the library is predefined and statically maintained as part of the library until selection during program generation").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of prompting the user to get the input and synthesizing the program parts as taught by Stack into the method of automatic program generation as taught by Chigira. The modification would be obvious because of one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to have the user prompt for the input to generate the program by selecting the suitable program components as suggested by Stack (col. 3, lines 27-36).

As per claim 6 the rejection of claim 5 is incorporated and further Chigira discloses:

- *a first model program that prescribes a data structure comprising one or a plurality of record types* (col. 3, lines 31-32 "After the analysis, the processing unit 22 prepares the data attribute analysis table shown in FIG. 5")

- *and a link between record types if a plurality of record type exists,* and that includes resolution logic for performing a setting for said predetermined processing *as to said data structure* (col. 3, lines 33-35 "the processing unit 22 selects one of the program part prototypes from the program part prototype library by referring to the analysis (predetermined settings) table")

- *and a second model program that includes resolution logic* for performing a setting for said predetermined processing as to an operation, *and that corresponds to a basic operation executed for said data structure* (col.3, lines 24-28 "The input information designates the data declaration statement to be processed by the program, the manner of use of the data (class) and the key where the class designates the retrieval table").

As per claim 7, Chigira discloses:

- *An automatic program generation method for automatically generating a program* (col. 1, lines 46-48 "provided an automatic program generation apparatus in a computer program development support system") *that will perform a predetermined processing,* (col. 1, lines 49-50 "input information relating to manner of use of data") said automatic program generation program comprising:

- *acquiring resolution information relating to* (col. 2, lines 39-40 "information

relating to the manner of use of the data") *a setting peculiar to said*

predetermined processing for the resolution logic (col. 2, lines 45-48 "the input

information is analyzed, one of the program part prototypes stored in the memory

unit is selected in accordance with the analysis (setting peculiar), and the selected

program is modified in accordance with the analysis to generate a program")

included in a model program in a data structure resolution unit corresponding

to a selected data structure (col. 2, lines 51-56 "The program part to be generated

is designated by the processing unit 22 which receives the data to be processed by

the program and the information relating to the manner of use of the data from the

input/output unit 21 through a general purpose text editor and analyzes it")

wherein said data structure resolution unit (col.2, lines 42-43 "a plurality of

program part prototypes as a program part prototype library") *includes said*

model program (col. 1, lines 52-53 "a processing unit for generating program

parts from the program part prototypes") *for a corresponding data structure* (col.

1, lines 54-56 "the input information is analyzed, one of the program part

prototypes stored in the memory unit is selected in accordance with the analysis"),

and said model program includes resolution logic for performing a setting

peculiar to said predetermined processing (col. 2, lines 45-48 "the input

information is analyzed, one of the program part prototypes stored in the memory

unit is selected in accordance with the analysis (setting peculiar), and the selected

program is modified in accordance with the analysis to generate a program"). It is

interpreted that input information is a setting indicating which processor to select

according to information.

- ***generating a program*** (col. 1, lines 52-53 "a processing unit for generating

program parts from the program part prototypes") ***for performing said***

predetermined processing (col. 1, lines "63-64 "program is generated based on

the selected (predetermined) program part prototype") .

- ***wherein said resolution unit comprises an analyser that analyzes said resolution***

logic included in said model program in said data structure resolution unit

corresponding to the selected data structure (col. 2, lines 44-48 "a processing

unit for generating a program part by analyzing the input information to the

input/output unit 21, selecting one of the program part prototypes from the

memory unit 23 in accordance with the analysis and modifying the selected

program part prototype").

Chigira does not explicitly prompts a user to input said resolution information for said

resolution logic based on the analysis and synthesizing the model program and the

acquired resolution information for the resolution logic.

However, Stack discloses in an analogous computer system prompts a user to

input said resolution information for said resolution logic based on the analysis (col. 5,

lines 24-28 "The process 70 begins with the election of a user choice 72 to define the file

structure 74, define a program structure 76, or create a field definition 78. With each of

these choices, the user is prompted, and provided with starting text as appropriate,

through a process that results in the production of definitions and text representing the

user's further inputs" see fig. 5 and related discussion) and synthesizing the model

program and the acquired resolution information for the resolution logic (col. 1, lines 54-

63 "program synthesizers based on libraries of pre-established program parts have been

proposed. A library based program synthesizer... program generator operates from

defined data to select a best match of a program part prototype from a part prototype

library. Each program part prototype stored by the library is predefined and statically

maintained as part of the library until selection during program generation").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to incorporate the method of prompting the user to get the

input and synthesizing the program parts as taught by Stack into the method of automatic

program generation as taught by Chigira. The modification would be obvious because of

one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to have the user prompt for the input

to generate the program by selecting the suitable program components as suggested by

Stack (col. 3, lines 27-36).

As per claims 10 and 13, The rejection of claim 6 is incorporated, and further, Chigira

discloses:

-   *wherein said first model program prescribes a simple type data structure* (col. 2,

    lines 52-53 "the data (simple type) to be processed")

-   *comprising one kind of record type* (col. 3, lines 12-13 "the preparation of a table

    (matrix type) having data relating to the macro name")

- *and includes resolution logic for providing an attribute for the record* (col.3, lines 14-16 "The processing unit 22 analyzes the input information of FIG.3 to prepare a data attribute analysis table shown in FIG. 5")

- *and wherein resolution logic for providing a setting in accordance with said predetermined specification is embedded in said second model program* (col.3, lines 24-28 "The input information designates the data declaration statement to be processed by the program, the manner of use of the data (class) and the key where the class designates the retrieval table")

- *and said second model program is to execute at least addition, deletion, update, and search operations for said record* (col.3, lines 14-16 "The processing unit 22 analyzes the input information of FIG.3 to prepare (at least addition, deletion, update) a data attribute analysis table shown in FIG. 5").

8. Claims 11 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chigira in view of Wahizaki, US Patent No. 5,212,634.

As per claims 11 and 14, the rejection of claim 6 is incorporated, and further Chigira does not explicitly discloses the data structure type is a slip type.

However, Washizaki discloses *a slip type data structure* (col.1, lines 42-43 "a slip processing program") *with one kind of header record type* (col. 2, line 67 "the sales slip number") *one kind of detail record type* (col. 2, lines 67-69 "unit goods price, number of goods sold 12, and total sales obtained by multiplying the unit goods price 11 by the number of goods sold") *and links for linking said one header record type and one or a plurality of said detail record types, and includes resolution logic for providing*

attributes for the header record and the detail record (col.4, lines 1-7 "A generated

process… indicates a process… slip number…found consistent of matched with … slip

number 16 at check step 3").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to have an apparatus for automatically generating a

program include a data structure of slip type as taught by Washizaki in corresponding to

automatic program generation as taught by Chigira. The modification would be obvious

because of one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to have data structure of

slip to generate slips for with information.

The limitation of executing record, addition, deletion, and search operation is

disclosed by Chigira as discussed in the rejection of claim 10.

9. Claim 12, 16, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Chigira in view of Webber et al, hereinafter called Webber, US Patent No. 5,331,546.

As per claims 12, 16 and 17, the rejection of claim 6 is incorporated, and further Chigira

does not explicitly discloses the *data structure is a type of time band, seat reservation,*

and plan as claimed.

However, Webber discloses the system to create itineraries using the data

structure of time and reservation type (col. 5 lines 34-38 "a storage device… include a

tariff file, a traveler file and a rules file… link… reservation system" and col. 6, lines 38-

40 "reservation system to check seat availability for…flight found" and col. 7, lines 16-

17 "the origin and destination locations and the time window or windows fro a trip). It is

inherent that data structure is a plan type, which stores records. Because in order to

process proper for a model or function it must access a record.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of data structure to make

reservations as taught by Webber in the method for automatic generating program as

taught by Chigira. The modification would be obvious because of one of ordinary skill in

the art would be motivated to have a system to make reservation automatically as

suggested by Webber (Abstract, "A travel planner... automatically construct... available

seats for a traveler's").

The limitation of executing record, addition, deletion, and search operation is

disclosed by Chigira as discussed in the rejection of claim 10.

10. Claims 18, 20, and 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Chigira in view of Schneier, hereinafter called Schneier, US Patent No. 5,850,516.

As per claims 18, 20, and 21, the rejection of claim 6 is incorporated, and further Chigira

does not explicitly discloses the *data structure types of a composition, tree type or

hierarchy.*

However, Schneier discloses a system using tree base data structure (col. 6, lines

25-40 "The tree structure are a type of data structure... plurality of leaf nodes...

predetermined mathematical operation... lower level nodes" and col. 6, lines 25-36 "a

first level... plurality of leaf nodes... and a top level (or root)... It is ...higher level

(closer to the root) node having as its children the lower level (Father from the root)

nodes from ... higher level nodes derived").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to incorporate the system using tree and hierarchy type

data structure as taught by Schneier in the method for automatically generating the

program as taught by Chigira. The modification would be obvious because of one of

ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to have a system using tree type database to

analyze the security system as suggested by Schneier (col. 3, lines 10-15).

The limitation of executing record, addition, deletion, and search operation is

disclosed by Chigira as discussed in the rejection of claim 10.

11. Claims 15 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Chigira in view of Suzuki et al, hereinafter called Suzuki, US Patent No. 6,470,323.

As per claims 15 and 19, the rejection of claim 6 is incorporated, and further Chigira

does not explicitly discloses the *data structure types of a stock and pedigree as claimed.*

However, Suzuki discloses system utilizing data structure of stock, and one kind

record (col. 3, lines 1-8 "The database… stores… transaction information… tracking

customer history… types of data structure… lists, tables" and col. 3, lines 15-16

"storage… storing records… relating… sales management").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to have a data structure of types as explained above in a

system as taught by Suzuki in corresponding to automatically generating the program as

taught by Chigira. The modification would be obvious because of one of ordinary skill in

the art would be motivated to have a record or array into the system to generate program

as suggested by Suzuki (col. 1 lines 31-36).

The limitation of executing record, addition, deletion, and search operation is disclosed by Chigira as claimed in claim 10.

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 5, 6, 7, 11, 12, and 14-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

13. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Satish S. Rampuria
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2124
08/09/2004

KAKALI CHAKI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100